

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,837	12/14/2005	Nigel P. Robinson	020541	8684	
	7590 09/08/200 INCORPORATED	EXAMINER			
5775 MOREHO	OUSE DR.	SETO, JEFFREY K			
SAN DIEGO,	CA 92121		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2458		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/08/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/537,837	ROBINSON, NIGEL P.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jeffrey Seto	2458	

	Jeffrey Seto	2458						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The Refer FileD <u>Provides 2008</u> FileS OF FILES THIS APPLICATION IN COUNTRIES FOR ADDITION FOR ALL OWNING. 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To a void abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it Examiner Note: if box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1,37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially red		ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a (corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			*					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments presented are not persuasive (see Continuation sheeet).								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
/Joseph E. Avellino/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2458								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of (11.): Applicant's arguments dated August 6, 2009 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Bauer fails to disclose "the controlling means being arranged to receive parameter data from the segmenting means to maintain the number of data frames in the buffering means between high and low watermark values." Bauer teaches a packet control unit (PCU) 18 that receives parameter data from a scheduler 26 (See paragraphs 11 and 20). Bauer further teaches that the PCU 18 uses the parameter data to control the scheduler 26 to maintain the number of data frames in a queue between an upper watermark (BVCU)) and a lower watermark (BVCU)) (See par. 29), Applying the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the PCU 18 and scheduler 26 of Bauer are able to satisfy the requirements of Applicant's controlling means and segmenting means, respectively.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Bauer does not teach "calculating the high and low watermarks in response to the received parameters". Bauer teaches that the high and low watermarks are calculated based on Bmax (See par. 40), and that Bmax is calculated based on the received parameters (See par. 41). Applying a broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, Bauer teaches that the high and low watermarks are calculated based on the received parameters.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Bauer doesn't teach a controlling means that controls a segmenting means. As discussed above, the PCU 18 of Bauer equates to Applicant's controlling means, and the scheduler 26 of Bauer equates to Applicant's segmenting means. Bauer further teaches that the PCU ultimately controls the scheduler (See par. 14, lines 1-4 and Figure 2).